UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,819	12/15/2005	Gerard Laslaz	05165	6413
	7590 11/03/200 CHULTZ & MACDOI	EXAMINER		
1727 KING STREET SUITE 105 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			MORILLO, JANELL COMBS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/560,819	LASLAZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Janelle Morillo	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CO	NDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a replies: (1) an amendme eal (with appeal fee) in co	Notice of Appeal. To avoid abarent, affidavit, or other evidence, wompliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f 	dvisory Action, or (2) the da ater than SIX MONTHS fror b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b)	n the mailing date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the correspond hortened statutory period fo than three months after the	ing amount of the fee. The appropria or reply originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 47	1.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or searcl w); ter form for appeal by ma	h (see NOTE below); aterially reducing or simplifying th	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12 See Continuation Sheet.) 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	16 and 41.33(a)).		PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	·	·	,
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections ui	nder appeal and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		·	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:			oe bedduse.
/Roy King/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793	/J. M./ Examiner, Art l	Unit 1793	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the amended mandatory presence and minimum of V has not previously been claimed, nor has the microstructural characteristics and solution heating, mold casting, or newly added claims 13 and 14, and would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because Al-Si foundry alloys do not recrystallize, and therefore there is no motivation to add V to the alloy of Tamamura has not been found persuasive. Even so, "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" teaches that V can be used as a grain refiner (p 45), as well as GB'282, who specifically teaches V can be used as a grain refiner to foundry Al-Si alloys (see Final Rejection for details).

Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because 'the presence of vanadium may even be detrimental to grain refinement in AlSi foundry alloys' (arguments page 5) has not been found persuasive. Applicant has not shown specific evidence supporting this assertion (contrary to the teaching of the prior art).

Applicant's argument that the present invention is allowable over the prior art of record because vanadium unexpectedly improves creep strength to the claimed Al-Si alloys has not been found persuasive. Applicant has not clearly shown specific unexpected results with respect to the prior art of record or criticality of the instant claimed range (wherein said results must be fully commensurate in scope with the instantly claimed ranges, etc. see MPEP 716.02 d)..